

University of Dayton

**eCommons**

---

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

---

4-16-2021

## Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate 2021-04-16

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

APC Minutes  
April 16, 2021

Committee Members: **Phil Anloague**, **Deb Bickford**, Connie Bowman, **Trevor Collier**, Michael Davies, Mary Ellen Dillon, **Jim Dunne**, **Laura Hume**, Jason Pierce, **Maier Qumsiyeh**, Andrew Sarangan, and **Tereza Szeghi** (chair). [**Bolded are present**]

1. Approval of minutes from [March 19](#), [March 26](#), and [April 9](#). Unanimously approved by all voting members of the APC, with one clarification asked for the April 9 notes about what unanimous meaning voting members
2. Discussion of the updated CAP 5-Year Review [Framework](#)
  - a. Jim highlighted aspects of the CAP document, including the fact that The 2010-04 Senate document requests a “thorough and systematic review,” and ECAS gave us feedback last year about reviewing goals. Jim has incorporated that into the revised document.
  - b. Jim summarized the elements of CAP and his perspective of how CAP should be reviewed, and made a case for the revised draft as it was conceived.
    - i. We would be looking at a sample of courses taught by key faculty in those courses. Advisors might also be tapped as they know about what is working and what might not be.
  - c. We need to discuss the question around “top-level goals.” If the working groups working on the components can be reflecting on CAP as a whole and speak to the overall goals, then we will be getting at this larger issue.
  - d. Last year, we reviewed and synthesized much of the feedback from previous years. How can that be used, going forward?
  - e. If we focus on the broad goals-- are we focusing on these concepts? Are the courses trying to get some learning consistent with this? Is the design of the courses consistent with the design that is called for and that we want to be focused upon?
  - f. We can get some sense of what we have in the components and the design, rather than having to collect a lot of new data.
  - g. Maier asks, who will collect the feedback? In the two year evaluation, there was a survey of faculty done, and the CAP office managed it. Are they expected to do that again? Can they do that again?
    - i. Who will collect all the data that we propose? The CAP office will not be able to do that.
    - ii. For the broad faculty and student surveys, we have not been very clear.
    - iii. If we were to survey faculty, we would need to categorize different types of faculty-- those who teach in CAP, those who don't teach in CAP, etc. (see notes from CAP feedback)
  - h. *Could there be a consultation on the results of work already done? If the components are nested under the broad aspirations of the programs, could we look at the existing data and see what has already been done?*
  - i. There could be a return to the question, “where are we with CAP?”

- j. We need to simplify this so that it isn't so daunting. If we don't think we can produce something we feel comfortable with, we would need to ask for more time.
- k. Under #3 of the draft, conduct the following reviews: if we are focused on CAP overall purposes and goals-- we need a clear indication of who is collecting this information, and what is reasonable to expect to be generated.
- l. Laura is going through the four year review for one of her courses this year-- the quality of examples from other history CAP reviews varies from one to the next. There is a lot of data even in the poor models of CAP 4 year reviews (in other words, the fact that some reviews are of lesser quality is data in itself-- and worthy of note). **Maybe the things the original document said we have to do-- maybe we can change them. We could say "this is no longer feasible" and we can modify it.** We could tell Leslie we need more time to look at this. What the original document has asked for is not feasible, and we think something else needs to be conceived. *It is time to re-evaluate the assessment tool.*
- m. The humanities commons' job is to talk about diversity to provide a foundation for others. Maybe we should work from the bottom up-- examine the foundation and work our way up.
- n. Maybe we should work through the components first-- a deep dive into the components, and that could lead to looking at the program overall.
- o. In the first year, there could be a look at faculty who are involved in teaching courses and the associate deans and professional advisors with a sense of how things are going with CAP, since they interact with students. They have a sense of how students are approaching CAP and the flows into courses. We could dig in with some key components and also get some broader views. But we could be examining some of these key components and see how they are working toward the bigger picture of CAP. Look at the components and see how they fit into the bigger picture. Laura's observation: **look at something specific in its context** (the big picture of the overall view of CAP). The focus is on the component. We could look at the language at each of the components. *Have an eye to how each component is nested in the broader program.* This will represent a shift in our approach, and likely create a process that is much more manageable.
- p. If we spot weaknesses in sequencing about courses we are wanting to see students develop, we can note them. We need to consider sequencing. We don't have enough courses for all students to take them in the sequential way in which they were intended. Many students cannot get into the next sequenced course because it is filled already (like SSC200 or ENG200), so they are taking a 300 level course instead. If we could figure this out and get a sense of how common this challenge is, it would provide good information for how we sequence courses and perhaps how many sections are offered to enable students to take the courses in intended sequence.
- q. By working on the components, we should ask for comments about sequencing since degree works doesn't allow us to see a picture of the sequencing.

- r. Professional advisors *and program directors* should be surveyed-- they can see how students are taking the courses (sequencing).
- 3. Preparation for presentation at the 4/16 Academic Senate meeting
  - a. Give an update on what APC has been doing with the documents
  - b. This will be determined in part by Tereza's conversation with Leslie.
    - i. Ask ECAS if the full Senate has to vote on this. Shouldn't we just keep them informed?